

REMARKS

Preliminary Remarks

The Final Office Action of August 29, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully analyzed. Claims 1-27 are currently pending, of which all stand rejected. Claims 1 and 16 are amended to more clearly describe the invention. Claim 9 is amended to correct a misspelling. Claims 24, 25, 26, and 27 are amended to correct the inadvertent conversion / omission of degree symbols contained in these claims as originally filed. These amendments do not add new matter or present any new issues that would require any further consideration and/or search by the Examiner. Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 because it (a) places the application in *prima facie* condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration by the Examiner because similar subject matter was previously considered by the Examiner and thus further consideration and/or search by the Examiner is not warranted; (c) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary; and (d) responds to formal matters set forth by the Examiner. For at least these reasons, entry of the present Amendment is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and/or rejections. All pending claims now being in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issue.

Objection to Claims

Claim 1 stands objected to as lacking proper antecedent basis. Claims 24, 25, 26, and 17 stand objected to because the degree symbol has either been omitted or replaced with a parenthesis. Claims 1, 24, 25, 26, and 27 are amended to correct the informalities noted by the

Examiner. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the objection for claims 1, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2003/0062845 to Yamazaki, *et al.* ("Yamazaki"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A claim may be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) if, and only if, a single prior art reference discloses each and every feature of the invention as recited in the claim. If the rejected claim recites even one feature that is not disclosed by the prior art reference, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection is improper and must be withdrawn. In this case, the rejection of claims 1-3 must be withdrawn because Yamazaki fails to disclose at least one feature recited in independent base claim 1, from which claims 2-3 depend.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other things:

A flat panel display having a plurality of sub-pixels, each sub-pixel comprising:

...only one driving thin film transistor including a semiconductor active layer having at least a channel area for driving the light emitting devices so that a predetermined current flows through the light emitting device according to the data signal,

wherein with respect to a direction of any grain boundary, the channel area of the switching transistor is situated along a first direction and the channel area of the driving transistor is situated along a second direction,

These features are not disclosed or suggested by Yamazaki. Instead, Yamazaki discloses:

The remarkable structure in FIG. 1 is that the current driver TFT's 102a and 102b are formed such that the channel length directions thereof are different from each other. (See, paragraph [0047])

Thus, Yamazaki's invention requires two driving TFT's electrically connected to a light emitting element 121 and connected in parallel with each other (See Figures 4 and 16). One of the two driving TFTs always has the same channel length direction as the switching TFT, and the other driving TFT has a channel length direction different from that of the switching TFT.

On the other hand, the embodiment of the invention recited in claim 1 operates with only one driving TFT at each sub-pixel. Moreover, the direction of the driving TFT's channel length differs from the direction of the switching TFT's channel length. (See, specification, page 20, lines 1-3, and Figures 1, 6, and 7). Thus, the embodiment of the invention recited in claim 1 does not further include a driving TFT whose channel length direction is the same as that of the switching TFT, as expressly taught by Yamazaki. For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 is allowable over Yamazaki.

Claims 2-3 are also allowable over Yamazaki by virtue of their dependencies on allowable base claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 4-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,013 to Komiya, *et al.* ("Komiya"). This rejection is moot in view of the amendments made to claims 1 and 16.

Claim 16 is amended to recite in pertinent part,

A flat panel display having a plurality of sub-pixels, each sub-pixel comprising:

...only one driving thin film transistor which is formed using a polycrystalline silicon and includes a semiconductor layer having a channel area for driving the light emitting device so that a predetermined amount of current flows through the light emitting device,

wherein the channel area of the switching thin film transistor has a first angle between a length direction of polycrystalline silicon grains and a direction of current flow in the channel area and the channel area of the driving thin film transistor has a second angle between a length direction of polycrystalline silicon grains and a direction of current flow in the channel area; and

wherein the first angle is not the same as the second angle.

Like claim 1, claim 16 recites each sub-pixel comprises only one driving thin film transistor. Komiya is cited only for the proposition it would have been obvious for a skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Yamazaki to use polycrystalline silicon. Consequently, Komiya does not cure the deficiencies of Yamazaki outlined above. Thus, claim 16 is allowable over the combination of Yamazaki and Komiya.

Claims 17-27 are also allowable over the combination of Yamazaki and Komiya at least by virtue of their dependencies on allowable claim 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-17 is respectfully requested.

Moreover, claims 4-15 are allowable over the combination of Yamazaki and Komiya at least by virtue of their dependencies on allowable base claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-15 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicants submit that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and/or grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Dated: November 29, 2005

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Telephone No. (703) 288-5105
Facsimile No. (703) 288-5139

HCP/BYC/kbs